

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 \* \* \*

4 LUIS CARDENAS-ORNELAS,

Case No. 2:21-cv-00030-APG-VCF

5 v. Plaintiff,

ORDER

6 WICKHAM, *et al.*,

7 Defendants.

8 On May 11, 2021, I ordered the defendants to file a response to the plaintiff's motions for

9 a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction within 21 days of the date of that order.

10 ECF No. 14. The response therefore was due on June 1, 2021. On June 1, 2021, the defendants

11 moved for an additional 21 days to file their response. ECF No. 17. The Deputy Attorney

12 General stated that he had not had an opportunity to conduct factual investigations into the

13 plaintiff's allegations in his motion, and that he has many other cases and several deadlines. *Id.*

14 at 2-3. I do not find this argument very persuasive. I am aware of several other cases filed in

15 this court that raise issues concerning yard time at High Desert State Prison. It would be both

16 surprising and troubling if the Attorney General's Office had not yet begun investigating at least

17 some of the most central allegations in the pending motion, such as what limits have been placed

18 on inmates like the plaintiff receiving yard time and the reasons for such limits. Accordingly, I

19 grant the defendants an extension of only seven days to respond to the motion for a preliminary

20 injunction and restraining order. The response is due by **June 8, 2021**.

21 ////

22 ////

1 I THEREFORE ORDER that the motion for extension of time to file a response to the  
2 motions for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction (ECF No. 17) is granted in  
3 part. The defendants shall file their response by **June 8, 2021**.

4 DATED THIS 2nd day of June, 2021.



5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23